

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT
OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

At the end of section 3, add the following new subsection:

(h) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized under this section may be used for research related to—

(1) the reproductive aging and symptom experience at midlife among Bangladeshi Immigrants, Sedentees, and White London Neighbors; and

(2) the diet and social stratification in ancient Puerto Rico.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, just beginning where the last comment on the last bill ended up, I appreciate the gentleman pointing out that this side did support a doubling of the NSF, and I was probably one of those who was there to support the increase; so no one, I think, can take the position that we are not uniformly as a body or as a party opposed to the general notion of increasing, making significant increases to applied research or general research, I should say, by the NSF.

What we can ask, though, is after the last election, has the American voter spoken with regard to the overall growth in Federal spending in all areas, whether it is in science and health care, whether it is in the war, for veterans or other areas; should we not look at each one individually and decide some should go up, some should remain the same, and some should go up at a slightly different way? That is what we are suggesting in the last amendment, simply that they should go up at a slightly different arc than they are in the underlying bill, 6.5 percent instead of 7 percent.

In the amendment before us right now, we look to see what is the underlying mission of the NSF. If we look at their mission statement, we see it is: "To promote the progress of science, advance the national health, prosperity and welfare and secure the national defense."

But during these tough fiscal times, both at the Federal level and at the family level, as I pointed out before, Congress must exercise good stewardship over every penny of taxpayers' dollars. This includes helping the NSF to focus on its priority projects.

Just as the gentleman from Georgia indicated, he has been visited by a number of people from various groups dealing with health issues, so have I; people with serious health issues like Alzheimer's, Parkinson's and diabetes.

They come and ask what are we doing and how are we prioritizing for their concerns within the NSF.

The amendment before you simply says can we find more than a quarter million dollars to fund research on such programs as reproductive aging symptoms of midlife Bangladeshi immigrants, but not more funding for research projects which might bring progress and eventually cures for some of the serious illnesses we have already heard about on the floor?

In addition, how can we justify research like the diet and social stratification of ancient cultures when here at home current medical research is so desperately needed?

Now, I understand that the point has been already made that we do not specifically itemize in the authorization bills each one of these specific programs, but these are, as the gentleman knows, programs which have already been authorized in the past and are continuing under the law right now into 2007 and 2008.

So doesn't it behoove us here in Congress to make a statement, to make a stand and say that at least in several of these areas we can make a position that our limited dollars should not be going to those areas, but instead we would make the position that they should be going for Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, diabetes and cancer research and some other areas that we have previously spoken about?

So I encourage my colleagues, do not only exercise good stewardship over the taxpayers' dollars, but in essence to also ensure that worthy projects receive the funding they deserve within that noble mission that I set forth at the beginning, "To promote the progress of science, advance the national health, prosperity and welfare and secure the national defense."

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for making precisely the case I have tried to make myself. The case I have tried to make myself is that it is not in the best purview of this body to intervene and micro-manage specific studies.

The reason I point that out is because the gentleman spoke about important health issues. One of the studies he seeks to eliminate funding for addresses an important health issue. Menopause is tremendously important to the women of this society. It is fine for two men to get up here and decide whether we want to fund menopause research; but I will tell you, every woman in this country is going to go through it, and they think menopause matters.

One of the studies that the gentleman wants to reduce funding for is very important in terms of addressing the factors that influence how menopause develops. I would share with the gentleman, although my knowledge is somewhat limited, I believe there are correlations between menopause and a

number of the issues the gentleman mentioned like cancer and other factors.

So if we believe we want to address those important matters, one of the very studies this gentleman is suggesting we eliminate funding for could very well address those very important issues. I would just urge you go back to your women constituents and suggest to them that you decided, based on your vast medical and anthropological expertise, and your vast understanding of women's health, that menopause did not merit research funding from the National Science Foundation.

And you may try to pick the title and say what does that have to do with Bangladeshi immigrants, et cetera. It may have a lot to do because natural experiments in which one population and another population may be of the same age, different, but subject to different cultural or dietary or other factors, and thereby have different variations in how they manifest certain biological processes can often give us profound insights into disease processes and the development of natural rhythms.

And for you or I to presume that we have the expertise to say that we don't think this study will do that because we know so much about menopause, sir, and I count myself among those "sirs," I think is vastly presumptuous. Menopause is profoundly important to the women of this country. This study deals with menopause, and I am tremendously grateful to the gentleman for picking this study because in so doing, you have made the best possible case for not micromanaging this fine agency.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All Members are reminded to address their comments to the Chair.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the angst most recently demonstrated is curious in light of the events of recent history regarding what this House has dealt with over the past week or two or three, and a little longer history in light of what this House and what this Congress deals with over and over and over again; and that is not the kind of appropriate kind of decisionmaking that my good friend from Washington so passionately advocates here in this bill, which is to delegate appropriate decisionmaking to people who have the expertise and have the knowledge to determine where those resources ought be spent and where those decisions ought be made.

Would that we as a Congress and we as a House use that same brilliance in our decisionmaking when we make decisions regarding health care. Again, as a physician, this Chamber makes incredible decisions that affect the very personal health care of individuals about which it has no knowledge whatsoever, and takes the decisionmaking authority from physicians and patients in an inappropriate way, I believe.